



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

117  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/814,816	03/31/2004	Ligang Zhang	026-0041	5295
22120	7590	11/15/2007	EXAMINER	
ZAGORIN O'BRIEN GRAHAM LLP			MATTHEWS, COLLEEN ANN	
7600B NORTH CAPITAL OF TEXAS HIGHWAY				
SUITE 350			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
AUSTIN, TX 78731			2811	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/15/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/814,816	<b>Applicant(s)</b> ZHANG ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b> Colleen A. Matthews	<b>Art Unit</b> 2811

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Colleen A. Matthews. (3) Nicole Cave.  
 (2) Lynne Gurley (SPE). (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 08 November 2007.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.  
 If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1,2,29,30,41,42 and 61-64.

Identification of prior art discussed: U.S. Pat. No. 6,847,282 to Gomez et al..

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

  
 LYNNE GURLEY  
 SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
 AV2811, TC2800

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Regarding claims 61-63, the attorney explained that in the Final Office Action mailed 9/11/07 the claims are rejected under 112 2nd paragraph because no function was specified by the words preceding "means" and that this rejection was improper because the words following "means for" in the claim such as "electrically coupling nodes" "routing" "electromagnetically shielding" specify the function. Examiner agreed that the rejection was improper with regard to the words preceding "means". However, the examiner noted that with regard to claim 61 that there appears to be inadequate written description necessary to support invoking of 112, sixth paragraph because the use of the terms "electrically coupling nodes" and "routing" do not have adequate disclosure set forth in the specification showing what is meant by the language. Terms and phrases must have support or antecedent basis in the description so that the meaning of the terms in the claim is understandable.

Regarding claims 1-2, 29-30 and 41-42, the attorney explained the support in the specification for the term "redistribution layers" and indicated that the Gomez reference does not disclose the type of redistribution layers described within the specification. Examiner noted that during examination limitations from the specification are not imported into the claims that the claim language only recites the term "redistribution layers" which does not require limitations such as specific materials or thicknesses. The term "redistribution layer" can be interpreted broadly. The examiner maintains that the Gomaz reference does provide proper support for "redistribution layers" in the disclosure of interconnection layers such as 514 and the concept of different levels of interconnects and transmission lines within integrated circuits in col 3 lines 28-48.

Attorney agreed to take examiners remarks into consideration. The examiner will reply to arguments presented by attorney when a written response is received.